IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN AT JODHPUR

CIVIL WRIT No. 162 of 2006

MAHENDRA KUMAR SWAMI
V/S
SECRETARY,BOARD OF SEC.EDU.,AJMER & ANR.

Mr. AJAY VYAS, for the appellant / petitioner

Date of Order : 26.4.2006

HON'BLE SHRI N P GUPTA,J.

ORDER

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner.

The petitioner seeks a direction to the respondents to correct the date of birth of the petitioner's son as 17.7.90, instead of 17.7.92.

It is alleged, that from the records of the Municipality etc., it is clear, that he was born on 17.7.90, but then, when he obtained admission in the school, his date of birth was wrongly mentioned as 17.7.92, and application was made for correction of the same, which has been forwarded by the Headmaster to the Secretary, Board of Education on 20.9.05, but no action has been taken, and thereupon, the notice was got served, being Annex.5, which too has not been replied.

A look at Annex.5 shows, that it is a letter by

the petitioner, pointing out, that the date of birth of his son was wrongly mentioned as 17.7.92, instead of 17.7.90, but then it is not disclosed, as to when it was so mentioned. Obviously, before appearing in Secondary School Examination, the boy must have undertaken regular education in the school, and it is not shown by the petitioner, as to what was the date of birth mentioned by the petitioner at the time, when the boy was first got admitted in the school. It is significant to note, that even while appearing for the Secondary School Examination, the forms are filled, requiring mention of the date of birth, and it appears, that the date of birth was mentioned by the petitioner, right since beginning, for reasons not known to others, except the petitioner, and now it appears, that the date of birth, as mentioned by the petitioner, is felt inconvenient, therefore, attempts are being made, for the so-called correction thereof.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has not been able to show, as to what is the legal right of the petitioner, to have the respondents directed to effect alleged correction, nor learned counsel for the petitioner has been able to show any legal procedure, whereunder this was required to be done, and is not being done by the respondents.

In that view of the matter, I do not find any

ground to entertain the writ petition. The same is, therefore, dismissed summarily.

(N P GUPTA),J.

/tarun/